

A RAMSEY THEOREM ON SEMIGROUPS AND A GENERAL VAN DER CORPUT LEMMA

ANUSH TSERUNYAN

ABSTRACT. Using a suitable notion of differentiation for subsets of a given semigroup G , we define a general class of filters on G that respect this notion; it includes idempotent ultrafilters, the filter of conull sets of a finitely additive invariant probability measure on G , the density-1 filter along a Følner sequence for an amenable group G , and finally, the filter IP^* of subsets of a semigroup G that meet every IP-set. We call the filters in this class Δ -filters and our main result is a Ramsey theorem for Δ -filters related to labeling edges between the semigroup elements with their differences (ratios). An application of this theorem yields a general version of the so-called van der Corput difference lemma, whose particular instances for the above-mentioned examples of Δ -filters were previously known, serving as principal tools in proving multiple recurrence results in ergodic Ramsey theory, such as Szemerédi's theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

The current paper concerns a generalization of certain types of lemmas, known as van der Corput difference lemmas¹, that are used in proving multiple recurrence results in ergodic Ramsey theory. Before delving into the main content of the paper, we illustrate the use of one such lemma in the proof of the famous Furstenberg Multiple Recurrence theorem, and discuss our generalization of these lemmas, as well as the Ramsey theorem responsible for it.

Multiple recurrence. One of the main themes in arithmetic combinatorics is proving multiple recurrence results for a given group. Such is the celebrated Szemerédi's theorem:

Theorem 1.1 (Szemerédi, [Sze75]). *Any subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ of positive upper density, i.e. $\bar{d}(A) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap [-n, n]|}{2n} > 0$, contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions. In other words, for every $k \geq 1$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$A \cap (A - n) \cap (A - 2n) \cap \dots \cap (A - kn) \neq \emptyset.$$

We think of the situation in this theorem as a kind of dynamical system by considering the right action of the group $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ on itself by right translation. Even though this system admits a finitely additive invariant probability measure², it is hard to work with because of only finite additivity. However, shortly after Szemerédi's original proof, Furstenberg came up with a way of translating this dynamical system to another one with a genuine countably additive invariant probability measure. This translation is now known as the *Furstenberg correspondence principle*, and it allows us to switch from the right translation action of a

¹The name comes from the well-known van der Corput difference theorem proved by Johannes van der Corput in [vdC31].

²One can define this by $\mu(B) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \alpha} \frac{|B \cap [-n, n]|}{2n}$ for every $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, where the limit is taken along a fixed nonprincipal ultrafilter α .

countable amenable³ group Γ on itself to a dynamical system of the form (X, ν, Γ, α) , where (X, ν) is a (countably additive) probability space and α is a measure-preserving⁴ left action of Γ on (X, ν) .

The corresponding multiple recurrence property for a measured system (X, ν, Γ, α) is the following: for a any ν -measurable $B \subseteq X$ with $\nu(B) > 0$, any $k \geq 1$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k \in \Gamma$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(1.2) \quad \nu(B \cap (\gamma_1^{-n} \cdot_\alpha B) \cap (\gamma_2^{-n} \cdot_\alpha B) \cap \dots \cap (\gamma_k^{-n} \cdot_\alpha B)) > 0.$$

The famous Furstenberg Multiple Recurrence Theorem [Fur77, FK78] states that this property holds for any such dynamical system with abelian Γ . In particular, for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ this implies Szemerédi's theorem due to the Furstenberg correspondence.

One of the key ingredients in the proof of the Multiple Recurrence Theorem is the fact that a certain strong quantitative version of (1.2) for $k = 1$, known as *weak mixing*, implies the analogous version of (1.2) for all $k \geq 1$; in other words, strong double recurrence amplifies itself to a strong multiple recurrence. This amplification is where the mentioned van der Corput difference lemmas come in.

Mixing along filters. To illustrate the van der Corput trick, we will now prove an instance of the following:

$$\text{strong double recurrence} \xrightarrow{\text{van der Corput trick}} \text{strong multiple recurrence}.$$

Here, by strong double recurrence, we mean certain kinds of *mixing*, so we start with a precise definition of the notion of *mixing along a filter* on a given semigroup G (above, $G = \mathbb{N}$), which generalizes the usual notions of mixing in ergodic theory, such as weak mixing, mild mixing, and strong mixing.

Let G be a semigroup and $\mathcal{F}$ a filter on G . The definitions of filters, limits along them, and other related terminology, is given in Section 2 below. Here is a typical example to keep in mind:

Example 1.3. For $G = \mathbb{N}$ (or any amenable semigroup), define *lower density* $\underline{d}(A)$ for subsets $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\underline{d}(A) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap [0, n]|}{n}.$$

The sets of (lower) density 1 form a filter $\mathcal{F}_d$, which we refer to as the *density filter*.

Definition 1.4. Let G be a semigroup, $\mathcal{F}$ a filter on G , and (X, ν) a probability space. Measure-preserving (right) action $(X, \nu) \curvearrowright^\alpha G$ is called *mixing along $\mathcal{F}$* if for every ν -measurable $A, B \subseteq X$, we have

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \nu(A \cap B \cdot_\alpha g^{-1}) = \nu(A)\nu(B).$$

Because $\nu(B \cdot_\alpha g^{-1}) = \nu(B)$, what this definition says is that as $g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, the sets A and $B \cdot_\alpha g^{-1}$ become more and more probabilistically independent. In other words, for any pair $(x, y) \in X^2$, the pair $(x, y \cdot_\alpha g)$ looks more and more like a random pair $(u, v) \in X^2$.

³Countable *amenable* groups are those that admit a *Følner* sequence, i.e. a sequence (F_n) of finite subsets of Γ such that for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|F_n \cap F_n \gamma^{-1}|}{|F_n|} = 0$, see [Wag93, 10.1, 10.11].

⁴This means $\nu(\gamma^{-1} \cdot_\alpha B) = \nu(B)$ for each ν -measurable $B \subseteq X$.

Given a probability space (X, ν) and a measure-preserving (right) action $(X, \nu) \curvearrowright^\alpha G$, we can lift it to a unitary (left) action $G \curvearrowright^\alpha L^2(X, \nu)$ by $(g \cdot_\alpha f)(x) := f(x \cdot_\alpha g)$. In terms of this unitary action, mixing along $\mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to the following: for every $f_0, f_1 \in L^2(X, \nu)$,

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \int_X f_0(g \cdot_\alpha f_1) d\nu = \int_X f_0 d\nu \int_X f_1 d\nu.$$

Remark 1.5. We can recover the usual notions of mixing by choosing appropriate filters: the density filter $\mathcal{F}_d$ for weak mixing [BG04, Theorem 1.1], the filter IP^* for mild mixing [Fur81, Proposition 9.22], and the Fréchet filter for strong mixing [Rud90, Definition 4.3].

The van der Corput trick. As mentioned above, one of the key ingredients in Furstenberg's proof of his Multiple Recurrence Theorem is the following instance of amplification of strong double recurrence to multiple.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the density filter $\mathcal{F}_d$ on the semigroup $\mathbb{N}$ and let Γ be an abelian group of measure-preserving automorphisms of a probability space (X, ν) . If for each $1_\Gamma \neq T \in \Gamma$, the induced action $\mathbb{N} \curvearrowright^T (X, \nu)$ is mixing along $\mathcal{F}$, then the following multiple recurrence property holds: for any $k \geq 1$, $1_\Gamma \neq T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k \in \Gamma$ and $f_0, f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k \in L^2(X, \nu)$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \int_X f_0(T_1^n f_1)(T_2^n f_2) \dots (T_k^n f_k) d\nu = \int_X f_0 d\nu \int_X f_1 d\nu \int_X f_2 d\nu \dots \int_X f_k d\nu.$$

This theorem is proved by induction on k , and to make the formulas and notation lighter, we will only prove it for $k = 2$. In fact, we prove a cleaner and more general statement in the following lemma:

Lemma 1.7. *Let G be a semigroup, $\mathcal{F}$ a filter on G with the van der Corput property (see Definition 1.10 below), and (X, ν) a probability space. Also, let $(X, \nu) \curvearrowright^\alpha G$ and $G \curvearrowright^\beta (X, \nu)$ be commuting measure-preserving right and left actions of a semigroup G on (X, ν) and let γ denote the combined right action $(X, \nu) \curvearrowright^\gamma G$ given by $x \cdot_\gamma g := g^{-1} \cdot_\beta x \cdot_\alpha g$. If the actions α, β, γ are mixing along $\mathcal{F}$, then for all $f_0, f_1, f_2 \in L^2(X, \nu)$,*

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \int_X f_0(g \cdot_\alpha f_1)(f_2 \cdot_\beta g) = \int_X f_0 \int_X f_1 \int_X f_2.$$

Note that the orthogonal decomposition $f_2 = (f_2 - \int_X f_2) + \int_X f_2$ reduces proving (1.8) to proving it in the following two cases:

Case 1: f_2 is constant $= \int_X f_2$. Then, triple recurrence in (1.8) becomes double:

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \int_X f_0(g \cdot_\alpha f_1) = \int_X f_0 \int_X f_1,$$

which is the statement that the action α is mixing along $\mathcal{F}$, so we are done.

Case 2: $\int_X f_2 = 0$. Then, (1.8) becomes:

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \int_X f_0(g \cdot_\alpha f_1)(f_2 \cdot_\beta g) = 0,$$

so we have reduced our task to proving the following eventual orthogonality statement:

$$(1.9) \quad \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle f_0, e_g \rangle = 0,$$

where $e_g := (g \cdot_\alpha f_1)(f_2 \cdot_\beta g)$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the L^2 -inner product.

Now we are in a position to appreciate the following property of filters on semigroups:

Definition 1.10. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup G is said to have the *van der Corput property* if for every bounded sequence $(e_g)_{g \in G}$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with a certain measurability condition⁵ on the map $g \mapsto e_g$,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, e_{gh} \rangle = 0 \implies \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle f, e_g \rangle = 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The conclusion in the implication above simply says that the sequence $(e_g)_{g \in G} \rightarrow 0$ along $\mathcal{F}$ in the weak topology of $\mathcal{H}$. This property is really a stronger and more general version of the simple Hilbert space fact (consequence of Bessel's inequality) that any bounded sequence of pairwise orthogonal vectors converges to 0 in the weak topology, where the convergence is in the usual sense, i.e. along the Fréchet filter. Here we write this fact in the appropriate form to make the similarity apparent: *For every bounded sequence $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$,*

$$\forall m \neq 0 \quad \forall n \langle e_n, e_{n+m} \rangle = 0 \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, e_n \rangle = 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 1.7.

Proof of Lemma 1.7. Recall that we have reduced to the case $\int_X f_2 = 0$ and we need to prove (1.9). By the van der Corput property, it is enough to show

$$(1.11) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, e_{gh} \rangle = 0.$$

So for fixed $g, h \in G$, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_g, e_{gh} \rangle &= \int_X (g \cdot_\alpha f_1)(f_2 \cdot_\beta g)(g \cdot_\alpha h \cdot_\alpha f_1)(f_2 \cdot_\beta h \cdot_\beta g) \\ &= \int_X (g \cdot_\alpha [f_1(h \cdot_\alpha f_1)])([f_2(f_2 \cdot_\beta h)] \cdot_\beta g) \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{putting } F_1^{(h)} := f_1(h \cdot_\alpha f_1) \\ \text{and } F_2^{(h)} := f_2(f_2 \cdot_\beta h) \end{array} \right] &= \langle g \cdot_\alpha F_1^{(h)}, F_2^{(h)} \cdot_\beta g \rangle \\ \text{[the action } \alpha \text{ is unitary]} &= \langle F_1^{(h)}, g^{-1} \cdot_\alpha F_2^{(h)} \cdot_\beta g \rangle \\ &= \langle F_1^{(h)}, F_2^{(h)} \cdot_\gamma g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now the fact that the action γ is mixing along $\mathcal{F}$ gives

$$\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, e_{gh} \rangle = \int_X F_1^{(h)} \int_X F_2^{(h)}.$$

But $\int_X F_2^{(h)} = \int_X f_2(f_2 \cdot_\beta h)$ and the action β is mixing, so $\lim_{h \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \int_X F_2^{(h)} = (\int_X f_2)^2 = 0$, and because $\int_X F_1^{(h)}$ is bounded, we get (1.11). $\square$

A *van der Corput lemma* for a given filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup is the statement that $\mathcal{F}$ has the van der Corput property. An instance of this was proven by Furstenberg (e.g. [Fur81, Lemma 4.9]) for the density filter $\mathcal{F}_d$, and hence the argument in the proof of Lemma 1.7 yields Theorem 1.6.

This apparent usefulness of the van der Corput property makes one wonder for which filters it holds. Besides the density filter, it was previously known to hold for the IP^* filter [Fur81, Lemma 9.24] and idempotent ultrafilters [BM07, Theorem 2.3] on arbitrary semigroups; moreover, a version of this property was noticed and used by the author in [Tse13] for the filter of conull sets of an invariant probability measure on a group. The proofs of these van der Corput lemmas that exist in the literature all follow a general flow,

⁵This condition vacuously holds in most cases.

even though different features of the filters are used to run this flow. The current work is devoted to pinning down a general property of filters on semigroups (satisfied by all of the above-mentioned examples) that implies the van der Corput property.

Underlying Ramsey theory. Besides the natural urge of trying to find one proof that works for all of the existing instances of the van der Corput lemmas, the author's motivation for the current work was a realization that the van der Corput property is driven by a certain Ramsey-theoretic condition related to graphs on semigroups, which we now briefly discuss.

Definition 1.12. Say that a filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup G has the Δ -Ramsey property if any graph $R \subseteq G^2$ satisfying $\forall^{\mathcal{F}} h \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g R(g, gh)$ contains arbitrarily large complete subgraphs, i.e. for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a sequence $(g_i)_{i \leq n}$ of elements in G such that $R(g_i, g_j)$ for all $i < j < n$; moreover, if $A \subseteq G$ is a “large enough” $\mathcal{F}$ -positive set then we can find such a sequence $(g_i)_{i \leq n}$ in A .

The Δ here refers to the fact that the hypothesis is on the *difference* graph $R(g, gh)$ rather than on $R(g, h)$ itself, and even though it states that the difference graph has lots of edges, the conclusion is still for the original graph R that it contains arbitrarily large complete subgraphs.

Here is a heuristic proof of the fact that Δ -Ramsey implies the van der Corput property; see Theorem 9.1 for a precise proof.

Proof of “ Δ -Ramsey $\Rightarrow$ van der Corput”. Let $\mathcal{F}$ have the Δ -Ramsey property and, assuming the hypothesis of the van der Corput property, suppose that the conclusion fails for some $f \in \mathcal{H}$. So, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $A := \{g \in G : |\langle f, e_g \rangle| \geq \varepsilon\}$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive. Choose a large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\|f\|^2 < n\varepsilon^2$, and, taking a small $\delta \ll \varepsilon^2/n$, consider the graph

$$R(g_1, g_2) := |\langle e_{g_1}, e_{g_2} \rangle| \leq \delta.$$

Because $\lim_{h \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, e_{gh} \rangle = 0$, we have $(\forall^{\mathcal{F}} h \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g) R(g, gh)$ and the Δ -Ramsey property gives $(g_i)_{i < n} \subseteq A$ with $(\forall i < j) R(g_i, g_j)$, in other words, many pairwise almost orthogonal bounded vectors in A . But then, by Bessel's inequality (up to a negligible error),

$$\|f\|^2 \gtrsim \sum_{i < n} |\langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle|^2 \geq n\varepsilon^2 > \|f\|^2,$$

a contradiction. □

So now the question is: Which filters have the Δ -Ramsey property? We give an answer to this based on a notion of differentiation for subsets of a semigroup that we define in Section 4. Our main theorem (Theorem 7.2) states that the filters that respect this notion of differentiation in an appropriate sense have the Δ -Ramsey property. These filters include all of those for which the van der Corput property was known, and thus, as a corollary of our Δ -Ramsey theorem, we obtain a van der Corput lemma generalizing its previously known instances.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Sławek Solecki for very useful suggestions and comments. Many thanks to John H. Johnson, Joel Moreira, Florian K. Richter, and Donald Robertson for their enlightening remarks, corrections, and references. I also thank James Cummings and Stevo Todorćević for their helpful comments and positive feedback.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 2.1. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a set S is a nonempty collection of subsets of S that does not contain $\emptyset$ and is closed upward and under finite intersections. Equivalently, a filter $\mathcal{F}$ is the collection of measure-1 sets of a finitely additive $\{0, 1\}$ -valued measure $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$ defined on an algebra of subsets of S .

Below we often identify $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$, and simply think of $\mathcal{F}$ as a measure.

For a filter $\mathcal{F}$ on S , we call a set $A \subseteq S$

- $\mathcal{F}$ -large if $A \in \mathcal{F}$ (i.e. A has measure 1),
- $\mathcal{F}$ -small if A^c is $\mathcal{F}$ -large (i.e. A has measure 0),
- $\mathcal{F}$ -positive, and write $A >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$, if A is not $\mathcal{F}$ -small (i.e. either A has measure 1 or the measure of A is undefined).

The dual ideal of $\mathcal{F}$ is the collection of all $\mathcal{F}$ -small sets and it is denoted by $\check{\mathcal{F}}$. For sets $A, B \subseteq S$, we write $A \sim_{\mathcal{F}} B$ if $A \Delta B$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -small. This clearly defines an equivalence relation, so we say that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant if for sets $A, B \subseteq S$ with $A \sim_{\mathcal{F}} B$, $A \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $B \in \mathcal{C}$. We write $A \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} B$ if $A \setminus B$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -small; equivalently, $A \cap H \subseteq B$ for some $\mathcal{F}$ -large $H \subseteq S$. We also write $A \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} B$ if $A \sim_{\mathcal{F}} B$ and $A \subseteq B$.

For a set $A \subseteq S$ and a property $P(\cdot)$ of elements of S , we write

$$\forall^{\mathcal{F}} x \in A \ P(x)$$

to mean that for all but an $\mathcal{F}$ -small set of x in A , $P(x)$ holds; consequently, we write

$$\exists^{\mathcal{F}} x \in A \ P(x)$$

to mean $\neg \forall^{\mathcal{F}} x \in A \ \neg P(x)$, i.e. there exists an $\mathcal{F}$ -positive set of x in A (in particular A is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive) such that $P(x)$ holds.

Lastly, we recall the notion of a limit along a filter. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on a set S and X be a topological space. For a sequence $(x_s)_{s \in S}$ and $x \in X$, we write

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} x_s = x$$

if for every open neighborhood $U \subseteq X$ of x , we have $\forall^{\mathcal{F}} s \in S (x_s \in U)$.

3. EXAMPLES OF FILTERS ON SEMIGROUPS

In the sequel, we consider filters on semigroups and we start by listing some examples. Henceforth, let G denote a semigroup.

Almost invariant filters. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G is called *invariant* if for every $A \subseteq G$,

$$A \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large} \Rightarrow \forall g \ (Ag^{-1} \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large}),$$

where $Ag^{-1} := \{h \in G : hg \in A\}$. Thinking of $\mathcal{F}$ as a finitely additive measure, this simply means that it is invariant under the right translation action of G on itself.

A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G is called *almost invariant* if for every $A \subseteq G$,

$$A \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large} \Rightarrow \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g \ (Ag^{-1} \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large}).$$

Working with almost invariant filters, it is convenient to use the following notation: for a set $A \subseteq G$, put

$$\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{F}}(A) := \{g \in G : Ag^{-1} \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large}\};$$

thus, if A is $\mathcal{F}$ -large then so is $\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$.

The class of almost invariant filters includes many important examples, most of which are actually invariant.

Examples 3.1.

- (a) The *Fréchet filter* on a group G , i.e. the filter containing all cofinite subsets of G , is invariant.
- (b) The filter $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ of *conull sets* of a finitely additive, or even subadditive, invariant nonzero measure μ on a semigroup G is invariant.
- (c) The filter $\mathcal{F}_d$ of subsets of density 1 of an amenable group G (along a fixed Følner sequence) is invariant.
- (d) If G is a Polish group (or more generally a Baire group⁶), then *the collection of comeager sets* forms a filter; in fact, this filter is closed under countable intersections. Due to continuity of group multiplication, this filter is invariant under right multiplication.
- (e) For $G = \mathbb{N}$, call $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ a set of convergence if $\sum_{n \in A} \frac{1}{n} < \infty$. Clearly, sets of convergence form an ideal and hence the collection $\mathcal{F}_h$ of complements of sets of convergence is a filter. Moreover, if A is a set of convergence then so is $A - n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$; thus, $\mathcal{F}_h$ is invariant.
- (f) Finally, *idempotent ultrafilters*, i.e. maximal filters $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup G such that for any $A \subseteq G$,

$$A \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large} \Leftrightarrow \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g \ (Ag^{-1} \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large}).$$

In particular, idempotent⁷ ultrafilters are almost invariant. They always exist on any semigroup by Ellis's theorem, see, for example, [Tod10, 2.1 and 2.9].

IP-sets and the filter IP^* . For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, put $\bar{n} := \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (although, set-theoretically there is not difference between n and $\bar{n}$) and put $\bar{n} := \mathbb{N}$ if $n = \infty$. Let G be a semigroup. For a countable (or finite) sequence $(g_i)_{i < n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, of elements of G and finite $\emptyset \neq \alpha \subseteq \bar{n}$, put $g_\alpha = g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \dots g_{i_k}$, where $i_1 > i_2 > \dots > i_k$ list the elements of α in the decreasing order; also put $g_\emptyset = 1_G$. Finally, let $\text{FP}(g_i)_{i < n} = \{g_\alpha : \alpha \subseteq \bar{n} \text{ finite}\}$ and call it a *finite product set* of length n .

A subset $A \subseteq G$ is called an *IP-set* (stands for Infinite-dimensional Parallelepiped) if it is a finite product set of infinite length, i.e. $A = \text{FP}(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for some sequence $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of (not necessarily distinct) elements of G . There is a tight connection between IP-sets and idempotent ultrafilters. Firstly, by [Ber10, Theorem 2.5]⁸, we have that every IP-set $A \subseteq G$ supports an idempotent ultrafilter, i.e. there is an idempotent ultrafilter p on G so that A is p -large. Conversely, we have the following standard fact:

Proposition 3.2. *For any semigroup G and an idempotent ultrafilter p on G , every p -large set contains an IP-set.*

⁶A topological group G is called Baire if it is not meager, i.e. a countable union of nowhere dense sets. Examples are Polish groups, as well as locally compact Hausdorff groups.

⁷These ultrafilters are called idempotent because their defining condition is equivalent to $\mathcal{F} * \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}$, where $*$ is the convolution operation defined in the same way as for measures.

⁸Although [Ber10, Theorem 2.5] is stated and proved for $G = \mathbb{N}$, the same proof works for any semigroup.

Proof. Let $A \subseteq G$ be p -large. We recursively define sequences $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements of G and $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of p -large subsets of G such that

- (i) $A_0 = A$,
- (ii) $A_{n+1} = A_n \cap A_n g_n^{-1}$,
- (iii) $g_n \in A_n$,

and we do it as follows: having A_n defined and p -large, by almost invariance, we know that $\text{Stab}_p(A_n)$ is also p -large, so in particular $A_n \cap \text{Stab}_p(A_n) \neq \emptyset$ and we take $g_n \in A_n \cap \text{Stab}_p(A_n)$. Thus, $A_n g_n^{-1}$ is p -large, and hence such is $A_{n+1} := A_n \cap A_n g_n^{-1}$, finishing the construction. Now it is easy to check that $\text{FP}(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq A$. $\square$

Thus, we get:

Corollary 3.3. *A set $A \subseteq G$ contains an IP-set if and only if it supports an idempotent ultrafilter.*

This corollary in its turn implies the following famous theorem (see [Fur81, Proposition 8.13]):

Theorem 3.4 (Hindman). *The class of IP-sets is Ramsey, i.e. if an IP-set is partitioned into finitely many subsets, one of these subsets contains an IP-set.*

This theorem allows us to define a filter IP^* for which the positive sets are exactly those that contain an IP-set:

$$\text{IP}^* = \{F \subseteq G : F \text{ meets every IP-set}\}.$$

To see that this is indeed closed under finite intersections, first note the following:

Lemma 3.5. *For every IP^* -large F and IP-set $A \subseteq G$, $F \cap A$ contains an IP-set.*

Proof. Immediately follows from Hindman's theorem and the definition of IP^* . $\square$

We can now easily conclude:

Proposition 3.6. *IP^* is a filter.*

Proof. Let F_1 and F_2 be IP^* -large and we need to show that so is $F_1 \cap F_2$. To this end, fix an IP-set $A \subseteq G$. By Lemma 3.5, there is an IP-set $A' \subseteq F_1 \cap A$. But by the same lemma, there is a further IP-set $A'' \subseteq F_2 \cap A'$, and thus $A'' \subseteq (F_1 \cap F_2) \cap A$, so in particular, $(F_1 \cap F_2) \cap A \neq \emptyset$. $\square$

Moreover, Corollary 3.3 implies that IP^* is the intersection⁹ of all idempotent ultrafilters on G .

Remark. Because of the latter fact, the statements below that are true for IP^* can be derived indirectly from them being true for idempotent ultrafilters.

⁹When taking intersections of filters, we think of them as the collections of large sets.

4. RECURRENCE AS A NOTION OF DIFFERENTIABILITY

We now proceed to define a quantitative strengthening of the notion of $\mathcal{F}$ -positive for subsets of G , namely, we introduce degrees of positiveness. Below the notation is set up to emphasize the analogy with differentiation.

Notation 4.1. For $A \subseteq G$ and $g \in G$, put $\partial_g A = A \cap Ag^{-1}$. As the notation suggests, we think of $\partial_g A$ as the directional derivative of A in the direction of g .

Definition 4.2. For a filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G , we call a set $A \subseteq G$ *0-recurrent* with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ if it is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive. For $n \geq 1$, we recursively define nested sets $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^n(A)$ and the notion of n -recurrence as follows: put

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^n(A) = \{g \in G : \partial_g A \text{ is } (n-1)\text{-recurrent with respect to } \mathcal{F}\}$$

and call A *n-recurrent* with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ if $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^n(A)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive. We also put $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^0(A) = A$.

A set $A \subseteq G$ is said to be *∞ -recurrent* (or just recurrent) if it is n -recurrent for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Lastly, A is called *$\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}$ -measurable* if it is either $\mathcal{F}$ -small or ∞ -recurrent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.

We omit writing the subscript $\mathcal{F}$ in $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^n(A)$ if it is clear from the context, and we also omit writing the superscript n if $n = 1$. Furthermore, we colloquially refer to the sets of the form $\Delta(A)$, for some $A \subseteq G$, as *Δ -sets*.

The notation suggests thinking of the sets $\Delta(A)$ as the sets of directions g along which the derivative $\partial_g A$ exists (i.e. $\partial_g A$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive) and call A once differentiable if $\Delta(A) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$; similarly, for $n \geq 2$, $\Delta^n(A)$ is the sets of directions g along which the derivative $\partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -times differentiable.

Examples 4.3.

- (a) For an almost invariant filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G , *every $\mathcal{F}$ -large set is recurrent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$* . To verify this, we prove by induction on $n \geq 0$ that every $\mathcal{F}$ -large set is n -recurrent. It is trivial for $n = 0$, so suppose it is true for $n \geq 0$ and let $A \subseteq G$ be $\mathcal{F}$ -large. Then for all $g \in \text{Stab}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$, $\partial_g A$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -large, and hence n -recurrent, by the inductive hypothesis. Thus, $\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{F}}(A) \subseteq \Delta^{n+1}(A)$, so $\Delta^{n+1}(A)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -large since so is $\text{Stab}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$. But this implies that A is $(n+1)$ -recurrent.
- (b) For the filter IP^* on a semigroup G , *every IP^* -positive set is ∞ -recurrent with respect to IP^** . To verify this, it is enough to show that every IP^* -positive set is 1-recurrent since then it easily follows by induction on $n \geq 0$ that every IP^* -positive set is n -recurrent. Recall that, by definition, a set $A \subseteq G$ is IP^* -positive if and only if it contains an IP -set. Thus, it is enough to prove that every IP -set is 1-recurrent, which follows immediately from the following:

Lemma 4.4. *For every IP -set $A \subseteq G$ and every $g \in A$, the set $\partial_g A$ contains an IP -set, and hence, $A \subseteq \Delta(A)$.*

Proof. Let $A = \text{FP}(g_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$ and fix $g \in A$. Thus, $g = g_{i_{n-1}} g_{i_{n-2}} \dots g_{i_0}$ for some indices $i_{n-1} > i_{n-2} > \dots > i_0$. But then, we still have $Ag^{-1} \supseteq \text{FP}(g_i : i > i_{n-1})$, and hence also $\partial_g A \supseteq \text{FP}(g_i : i > i_{n-1})$. Therefore, $g \in \Delta(A)$, so $A \subseteq \Delta(A)$. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on a semigroup G and let $A \subseteq G$ be n -recurrent. Then there is a sequence $(h_i)_{i < n} \subseteq \Delta(A)$ such that $\bigcap_{\alpha \in \bar{n}} Ah_{\alpha}^{-1} = \partial_{h_{n-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} A >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. In particular,*

A contains positively many shifts of a finite product set of length n ; that is, for every $g \in \partial_{h_{n-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} A$, $g \cdot \text{FP}(h_i : i < n) \subseteq A$.

Proof. Take $h_0 \in \Delta^n(A)$ and applying induction to $\partial_{h_0} A$ get $(h_i)_{1 \leq i < n} \subseteq \Delta(\partial_{h_0} A) \subseteq \Delta(A)$ such that $\partial_{h_{n-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} A >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. $\square$

5. RECURRENCE RESPECTING FILTERS

We now define a class of filters for which the notion of recurrence is well-defined on $G/\sim_{\mathcal{F}}$, i.e. for each $n \geq 0$, the collection of n -recurrent sets is $\mathcal{F}$ -invariant.

Definition 5.1. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G is said to *respect recurrence* if for all $n \geq 1$ and subsets $A \sim_{\mathcal{F}} \tilde{A}$ of G , A is n -recurrent if and only if $\tilde{A}$ is n -recurrent.

Example 5.2. The filter IP^* on any semigroup G respects recurrence. This is because every IP^* -positive set is automatically ∞ -recurrent, so if $A \sim B$, then

$$A \text{ is } n\text{-recurrent} \Leftrightarrow A >_{\mathcal{F}} 0 \Leftrightarrow B >_{\mathcal{F}} 0 \Leftrightarrow B \text{ is } n\text{-recurrent}.$$

The next proposition unravels the above definition to make it easier to check.

Notation 5.3. For sets $A, H \subseteq G$, put $A^H = A \cap H$.

Proposition 5.4. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G respects recurrence if and only if for every $\mathcal{F}$ -large set H , for every $n \geq 1$ and every n -recurrent set A , $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in G$ such that $A' \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} Hg^{-1}$ for some $(n-1)$ -recurrent set $A' \subseteq \partial_g A$.

Proof. For $\Rightarrow$, note that if A is n -recurrent and H is $\mathcal{F}$ -large, then A^H is still n -recurrent, so $\Delta^n(A^H)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive. Thus, for any $g \in \Delta^n(A^H)$, $A' := \partial_g(A^H) \subseteq \partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent and $A' \subseteq Hg^{-1}$.

For $\Leftarrow$, we assume the right-hand side and prove by induction on n that if H is $\mathcal{F}$ -large and A is n -recurrent, then A^H is also n -recurrent. The base case $n = 0$ is trivial because if A is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive then so is A^H . Now suppose it holds for $n-1$, and let A be n -recurrent and H be $\mathcal{F}$ -large. Then, $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in G$ such that there is an $(n-1)$ -recurrent set $A' \subseteq \partial_g A$ with $A' \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} Hg^{-1}$, and hence $A' \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} \partial_g H$. Thus, $A' \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} \partial_g(A^H)$ and hence $A' \cap H' \subseteq \partial_g(A^H)$ for some $\mathcal{F}$ -large H' . By induction, $A' \cap H'$ is still $(n-1)$ -recurrent, and hence so is $\partial_g(A^H)$. The fact that this holds for $\mathcal{F}$ -positively many $g \in G$ means that A^H is n -recurrent. $\square$

Example 5.5. It follows immediately from the last proposition that any almost invariant filter respects recurrence. This is because for every $g \in \Delta^n(A) \cap \text{Stab}(H)$, $A' := \partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent and Hg^{-1} is $\mathcal{F}$ -large, so $B \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} Hg^{-1}$ holds for every set $B \subseteq G$, and in particular, for $B = A'$.

Localization. In this subsection, we define a localization of the property of respecting recurrence, the sole purpose of which is to exhibit an analogy with the notion of being n -thick in $\Delta(A)$ defined below (see Definition 6.12). Thus, impatient readers can safely skip this subsection.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on a semigroup G . Recall that the property of $\mathcal{F}$ respecting recurrence means that for every $\mathcal{F}$ -large H , $A \cap H$ is n -recurrent, for any n -recurrent set $A \subseteq G$ and $n \geq 0$. In other words, H contains a thick enough portion of A to capture the n -recurrence of it. The following is an alternative way of defining the latter property for arbitrary sets.

Definition 5.6. For sets $A, D \subseteq G$ and $n \geq 1$, D is said to be *recurrently n -thick in A* (or just recurrently A^n -thick) if either A is not n -recurrent, or else, $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in G$ such that

- (i) $\partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent;
- (ii) $\partial_g D$ is recurrently $(n-1)$ -thick in $\partial_g A$.

For $n = 0$, we declare D to be *recurrently 0-thick in A* , if either A is $\mathcal{F}$ -small, or else, $A \cap D >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$.

Unraveling the recursive definitions, we get the following.

Proposition 5.7. *For $n \geq 0$, an n -recurrent set $A \subseteq G$ and a set $D \subseteq G$, D is recurrently n -thick in A if and only if $A \cap D$ is n -recurrent.*

Proof. We prove by induction on n . For $n = 0$, it is trivial, so let $n \geq 1$ and, assuming the equivalence is true for $n-1$, prove for n .

$\Rightarrow$: Suppose $A \cap D$ is n -recurrent. Then $\Delta^n(A \cap D) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$ and for any $g \in \Delta^n(A \cap D)$, $\partial_g(A \cap D)$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent. But $\partial_g(A \cap D) = (\partial_g A) \cap (\partial_g D)$, so by induction, $\partial_g D$ is recurrently $(n-1)$ -thick in $\partial_g A$.

$\Leftarrow$: Suppose D is recurrently n -thick in A . Then $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in G$ such that $\partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent and $\partial_g D$ is recurrently $(n-1)$ -thick in $\partial_g A$. Thus, by induction, $(\partial_g A) \cap (\partial_g D) = \partial_g(A \cap D)$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent. $\square$

Corollary 5.8. *A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup G respects recurrence if and only if every $\mathcal{F}$ -large $H \subseteq G$ is recurrently n -thick in A for every $A \subseteq G$ and $n \geq 0$.*

6. Δ -SETS AND CONTAINING A THICK ENOUGH PART OF THEM

The property of respecting recurrence is still not enough for the Δ -Ramsey theorem below to hold. As explained above, respecting recurrence means that every $\mathcal{F}$ -large set H contains a thick enough part of every set A to capture its degree of recurrence. However, we also need H to contain a thick enough part of $\Delta(A)$ to capture the main role played by $\Delta(A)$ for A . In this section we explain what this main role is and make the notion of being thick enough in $\Delta(A)$ precise.

We start by recording some algebraic properties of ∂ and Δ .

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on a semigroup G , $A \subseteq G$, $g, h \in G$, $n, m \geq 0$.*

- (a) *Mixed derivatives are equal: $\partial_g \partial_h A = \partial_h \partial_g A$.*
- (b) *∂ is superassociative: $\partial_{hg} A \supseteq \partial_h \partial_g A$.*
- (c) *Δ and ∂ subcommute: $\Delta^n(\partial_g A) \subseteq \partial_g \Delta^n(A)$.*
- (d) *Δ is subassociative: $\Delta^{n+m}(A) \subseteq \Delta^n(\Delta^m(A))$. In particular, if A is $(n+m)$ -recurrent, then $\Delta^m(A)$ is n -recurrent.*

Proof. Part (a) is trivial, and for (b) just compute: $\partial_h \partial_g A = A \cap Ag^{-1} \cap Ah^{-1} \cap Ag^{-1}h^{-1} \subseteq A \cap Ag^{-1}h^{-1} = \partial_{hg} A$.

For (c), we assume that $n \geq 1$ since $n = 0$ case follows from the convention that $\Delta^0(B) = B$ for any $B \subseteq G$. Note that $\partial_g A \subseteq A$ trivially implies $\Delta^n(\partial_g A) \subseteq \Delta^n(A)$. As for $\Delta^n(\partial_g A) \subseteq \Delta^n(A)g^{-1}$, fixing $h \in \Delta^n(\partial_g A)$, we have that $\partial_h \partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent and is contained in $\partial_{hg} A$, by part (b). So, $\partial_{hg} A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent as well, and hence, $hg \in \Delta^n(A)$.

We prove (d) by induction on n . The $n = 0$ case follows from the convention, so we suppose that the statement is true for $n \geq 0$ and prove for $n+1$. Fixing $g \in \Delta^{n+m+1}(A)$, we have that $\partial_g A$ is $(n+m)$ -recurrent, and hence, by induction, $\Delta^m(\partial_g A)$ is n -recurrent. But by part (c), $\Delta^m(\partial_g A) \subseteq \partial_g \Delta^m(A)$, so $\partial_g \Delta^m(A)$ is also n -recurrent, and thus, $g \in \Delta^{n+1}(\Delta^m(A))$. $\square$

Derivation trees. We now digress a bit to give a picture of what underlies the definitions of recurrence and Δ -sets. However, this subsection is not used in the proofs below and may be safely skipped.

Notation 6.2. For a set S , we denote by $S^{<\mathbb{N}}$ the set of finite tuples of elements of S , i.e. $S^{<\mathbb{N}} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S^n$, where $S^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. For $s \in S^{<\mathbb{N}}$, we denote by $|s|$ the length of s ; thus, s is a function from $\{0, 1, \dots, |s| - 1\}$ to S . Recalling that functions are sets of pairs, the notation $s \subseteq t$ for $s, t \in S^{<\mathbb{N}}$ means that $|s| \leq |t|$ and $s(i) = t(i)$ for all $i < |s|$. Finally, for $s \in S^{<\mathbb{N}}$ and $x \in S$, we write $s^\frown x$ to denote the extension of s to a tuple of length $|s| + 1$ that takes the value x at index $|s|$.

Definition 6.3. For a set S , a subset T of $S^{<\mathbb{N}}$ is called a (set theoretic) *tree* on S if it is closed downward under $\subseteq$, i.e. for all $s, t \in S^{<\mathbb{N}}$, if $t \in T$ and $s \subseteq t$, then $s \in T$.

Notation 6.4. For a tree T on a set S and $s \in T$, define the set of extensions of s in T by $\text{ext}_T(s) := \{x \in S : s^\frown x \in T\}$. Call s a *leaf* of T if $\text{ext}(s) = \emptyset$. Furthermore, define

$$\text{Depth}(T) := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } T = \emptyset \\ \max_{s \in T} |s| & \text{if } T \neq \emptyset \text{ and this max exists} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

as well as

$$\text{depth}(T) := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } T = \emptyset \\ \min\{|s| : s \text{ is a leaf in } T\} & \text{if } T \text{ has a leaf} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We call $\alpha \in S^{\mathbb{N}}$ an *infinite branch* through T if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \upharpoonright_n \in T$. Note that, in general, $\text{Depth}(T) = \infty$ does not imply that there is an infinite branch through T , while $\text{depth}(T) = \infty$ does.

Now let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on a semigroup G . Call a tree T on G an $\mathcal{F}$ -tree if for every $s \in T$, either s is a leaf or $\text{ext}_T(s) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$.

For $s = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{m-1}) \in G^{<\mathbb{N}}$ and $A \subseteq G$, put $\partial_s A := \partial_{h_{m-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} A$ with convention that $\partial_\emptyset A = A$.

Definition 6.5. For a set A , the derivation tree $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}(A)$ (or just $\mathcal{T}(A)$) of A with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ is a tree on G defined by

$$s \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}}(A) \iff \forall t \subseteq s \ \partial_t A \text{ is } (|s| - |t|)\text{-recurrent}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}(A)$ is actually an $\mathcal{F}$ -tree on $\Delta(A)$. Moreover, for each $s \in \mathcal{T}(A)$ that is not a leaf, $\text{ext}_{\mathcal{T}(A)}(s) = \Delta(\partial_s A) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $A \subseteq G$.*

- (a) $\mathcal{T}(A) = \emptyset$ if and only if A is $\mathcal{F}$ -small.
- (b) $\text{Depth}(\mathcal{T}(A)) = \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} : A \text{ is } n\text{-recurrent}\}$.
- (c) If $\mathcal{T}(A)$ has an infinite branch then $\Delta(A)$ contains an IP-set. In fact, if $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an infinite branch of $\mathcal{T}(A)$, then $\Delta(A) \supseteq \text{FP}(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. Follows from the definitions. □

Examples 6.7.

- (a) For an almost invariant filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G and an $\mathcal{F}$ -large set $H \subseteq G$, $\mathcal{T}(H)$ has an infinite branch $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in G^{\mathbb{N}}$, which can be defined by recursion as follows: for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $h_n \in \text{Stab}(\partial_{h_{n-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} H)$. In particular, $\Delta(H)$ contains an IP-set.
- (b) For the IP^* -filter on G and an IP^* -positive set $A \subseteq G$, $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}(A)) = \infty$, i.e. $\mathcal{T}(A)$ does not have leaves. This is because if $s \in \mathcal{T}(A)$ then $\partial_s A >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$ and hence $\partial_s A$ is 1-recurrent (by Example 4.3(b)), so $\Delta(\partial_s A) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. In particular, there are infinite branches through $\mathcal{T}(A)$.

Main property of Δ -sets. Taking $m = 1$ and replacing n with $n - 1$ in part (d) or Proposition 6.1, we get:

Corollary 6.8. *For a filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup G and $A \subseteq G$, $\Delta^{n-1}(\Delta(A)) \supseteq \Delta^n(A)$. In particular, if A is n -recurrent, then $\Delta(A)$ is $(n - 1)$ -recurrent.*

Thus, containing a Δ -set of an n -recurrent set is a structurally strong way of being $(n - 1)$ -recurrent.

We now arrive at a property that illustrates the main role played by $\Delta(A)$ for A :

Corollary 6.9 (Main property of Δ -sets). *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on a semigroup G . For $n \geq 1$ and an n -recurrent set $A \subseteq G$, $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in \Delta(A)$ (namely, $g \in \Delta^n(A)$) such that*

- (i) $\partial_g A$ is $(n - 1)$ -recurrent;
- (ii) $\partial_g \Delta(A) \supseteq \Delta(\partial_g A)$; in particular, $\partial_g \Delta(A)$ is $(n - 2)$ -recurrent, if $n \geq 2$.

Proof. Because A is n -recurrent, we have that $\Delta(A) \supseteq \Delta^n(A) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. But for any $g \in \Delta^n(A)$, $\partial_g A$ is $(n - 1)$ -recurrent. Moreover, by (c) of Proposition 6.1, we have $\partial_g \Delta(A) \supseteq \Delta(\partial_g A)$. $\square$

Remark 6.10. This corollary says that there are positively many directions g in $\Delta(A)$ that are “differentiation-friendly” for both A and $\Delta(A)$, simultaneously. Moreover, the property that $\Delta(A)$ contains all differentiation-friendly directions for A is maintained by their directional derivatives along g , i.e. $\partial_g \Delta(A)$ still contains all differentiation-friendly directions for $\partial_g A$.

Iterating Corollary 6.9, we get that the derivation trees of A and $\Delta(A)$ have much in common:

Proposition 6.11. *For $A \subseteq G$, the set $\mathcal{T}(A) \cap \mathcal{T}(\Delta(A))$ contains an $\mathcal{F}$ -tree T with $\text{depth}(T) = \text{Depth}(\mathcal{T}(A)) - 1$ such that for each $s \in T$, $\partial_s \Delta(A) \supseteq \Delta(\partial_s A)$.*

Being thick enough in $\Delta(A)$. Using the analogy with Definition 5.6, we can try to define what it means for a set $D \subseteq G$ to contain a thick enough part of $\Delta(A)$ as a weakening of the main property of $\Delta(A)$ (i.e. Corollary 6.9); more precisely, for an n -recurrent set A , we could say that D is n -thick in $\Delta(A)$ if $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in D$ such that

- $\partial_g A$ is $(n - 1)$ -recurrent
- $\partial_g D$ is $(n - 1)$ -thick in $\Delta(\partial_g A)$.

This definition almost works, but it has one wrinkle: it is not stable under $\mathcal{F}$ -small perturbations; that is, being n -thick in $\Delta(A)$ does not imply being n -thick in $\Delta(\tilde{A})$ for $\tilde{A} \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} A$ (i.e. $\tilde{A} \sim_{\mathcal{F}} A$ and $\tilde{A} \subseteq A$). Incorporating this into the definition, we get:

Definition 6.12. For sets $A, D \subseteq G$ and $n \geq 1$, D is said to be **n -thick in $\Delta(A)$** (or just $\Delta(A)^n$ -thick) if for any n -recurrent $\tilde{A} \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} A$, $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in D$ such that

- (i) $\partial_g \tilde{A}$ is $(n - 1)$ -recurrent;

(ii) $\partial_g D$ is $(n-1)$ -thick in $\Delta(\partial_g \tilde{A})$.

For $n = 0$, we declare D to be **0-thick** in $\Delta(\mathbf{A})$, for arbitrary $A, D \subseteq G$.

Proposition 6.13 (Closure properties). *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on G , $n \geq 0$, and $A, D \subseteq G$ with D being $\Delta(A)^n$ -thick.*

- (a) *Small downward closure: D is $\Delta(\tilde{A})^n$ -thick for any $\tilde{A} \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} A$.*
- (b) *Upward closure: If $\mathcal{F}$ respects recurrence and A is n -recurrent, then D is $\Delta(A_0)^n$ -thick for any $A_0 \supseteq A$.*

Proof. Part (a) trivially follows from the transitivity of $\lesssim_{\mathcal{F}}$, and we prove (b) by induction on n . The base case $n = 0$ is trivial, so let $n \geq 1$ and suppose the statement is true for $n-1$. Let $\tilde{A}_0 \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} A_0$, so $\tilde{A}_0 = A_0^H$ for some $\mathcal{F}$ -large H . Because $\tilde{A} := A^H \lesssim_{\mathcal{F}} A$ and $\mathcal{F}$ respects recurrence, $\tilde{A}$ is n -recurrent, and hence, $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in D$ such that $\partial_g \tilde{A}$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent and $\partial_g D$ is $(n-1)$ -thick in $\Delta(\partial_g \tilde{A})$. Since $\partial_g \tilde{A} \subseteq \partial_g \tilde{A}_0$, $\partial_g \tilde{A}_0$ is also $(n-1)$ -recurrent and the induction implies that $\partial_g D$ is also $(n-1)$ -thick in $\Delta(\partial_g \tilde{A}_0)$. This means that D is n -thick in $\Delta(\tilde{A}_0)$. $\square$

We can also essentially recover Corollary 6.8:

Proposition 6.14. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on G , $n \geq 1$, $A, D \subseteq G$, and suppose that A is n -recurrent and D is $\Delta(A)^n$ -thick. Then $\Delta^n(A) \cap \Delta^{n-1}(D)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive, and thus, D is $(n-1)$ -recurrent.*

Proof. We prove by induction on n . For $n = 1$, $\Delta^0(D) = D$ and D being $\Delta(A)^1$ -thick is equivalent to $\Delta^1(A) \cap D >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. Let $n \geq 2$ and suppose the statement is true for $n-1$. By $\Delta(A)^n$ -thickness, $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in D \cap \Delta^n(A)$ such that $\partial_g D$ is $(n-1)$ -thick in $\partial_g A$. But $\partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent, so by induction, $\Delta(\partial_g A) \cap \Delta^{n-2}(\partial_g D) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. In particular, $\partial_g D$ is $(n-2)$ -recurrent, so $g \in \Delta^{n-1}(D)$. Since there are positively many such g in $\Delta^n(A)$, it follows that $\Delta^n(A) \cap \Delta^{n-1}(D) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$. $\square$

Examples 6.15.

- (a) For an almost invariant filter $\mathcal{F}$ on G , any $\mathcal{F}$ -large H is $\Delta(A)^n$ -thick for any $n \geq 0$ and $A \subseteq G$; indeed, if $n \geq 1$ and A is n -recurrent, then $\Delta^n(A) \subseteq_{\mathcal{F}} H \cap \text{Stab}(H)$ and hence $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} g \in H \cap \text{Stab}(H)$ such that $\partial_g A$ is $(n-1)$ -recurrent. Moreover, since $g \in \text{Stab}(H)$, $\partial_g H$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -large, so, by induction on n , it must be n -thick in $\Delta(\partial_g A)$.
- (b) With respect to IP^* , every positive set A is $\Delta(A)^n$ -thick for any $n \geq 0$; indeed, let $\tilde{A} \lesssim A$ and hence, $\tilde{A}$ is IP^* -positive, so it contains an IP-set P . By Lemma 4.4, $P \subseteq \Delta(P) \subseteq \Delta(\tilde{A})$, so for any $g \in P$, $\partial_g \tilde{A}$ is positive, and hence $(n-1)$ -recurrent. By induction on n , $\partial_g \tilde{A}$ is $\Delta(\partial_g \tilde{A})^{n-1}$ -thick, and hence so is $\partial_g A$ because it contains $\partial_g \tilde{A}$.

Lastly, iterating the definition of being n -thick in $\Delta(A)$, we get what it means in terms of derivation trees:

Proposition 6.16. *For an n -recurrent set $A \subseteq G$ and a set $D \subseteq G$ that is n -thick in $\Delta(A)$, the set $\mathcal{T}(A) \cap \mathcal{T}(D)$ contains an $\mathcal{F}$ -tree T with $\text{depth}(D) = n-1$ such that for each $s \in T$, $\partial_s D \cap \Delta(\partial_s A) >_{\mathcal{F}} 0$.*

7. Δ -FILTERS AND THE Δ -RAMSEY THEOREM

Finally, we define the class of filters for which the Δ -Ramsey theorem below holds.

Definition 7.1. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on a semigroup G is called a Δ -filter if

- (i) $\mathcal{F}$ respects recurrence (equivalently, every $\mathcal{F}$ -large H is recurrently n -thick in A , for any n -recurrent $A \subseteq G$ and $n \geq 0$);
- (ii) every $\mathcal{F}$ -large H is n -thick in $\Delta(A)$, for any $A \subseteq G$ and $n \geq 0$.

As Examples 6.15(a) and 6.15(b) show, all almost invariant filters on a semigroup G , as well as the IP^* filter on G , are Δ -filters.

We are now ready to state and prove the main theorem.

Theorem 7.2 (Δ -Ramsey). *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Δ -filter on G and $R \subseteq G^2$ a binary relation. If*

$$\forall^{\mathcal{F}} h \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g R(g, gh),$$

then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a sequence $(g_i)_{i \leq n}$ of elements in G such that

$$\forall i < j R(g_j, g_i).$$

Moreover, if $A \subseteq G$ is an n -recurrent set, we can ensure $(g_i)_{i \leq n} \subseteq A$.

Proof. First let's introduce some notation: for $\alpha, \beta \in \bar{m} := \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$, we write $\beta < \alpha$ if $\max(\beta) < \min(\alpha)$ or one of α, β is $\emptyset$. For $h, h' \in G$, put $R(\cdot h, \cdot h') := \{g \in G : R(gh, gh')\}$, and thus, the set

$$H := \{h \in G : R(\cdot, \cdot h) \text{ is } \mathcal{F}\text{-large}\}$$

is $\mathcal{F}$ -large by the hypothesis. Also, if A is not specified, put $A = G$.

To prove this theorem, we will construct sequences $(h_m)_{m < n}$ of elements in H and $(A_m)_{m \leq n}$ of subsets of A such that for every $m \leq n$, we have

- (m.1) $A_m \subseteq \partial_{h_{m-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} A$ is $(n-m)$ -recurrent;
- (m.2) for all $\alpha, \beta \subseteq \bar{m}$ with $\emptyset \neq \beta < \alpha$, $A_m \subseteq R(\cdot h_\alpha, \cdot h_\alpha h_\beta)$;
- (m.3) for all $\alpha \subseteq \bar{m}$, $h_\alpha \in H$;
- (m.4) $H_m := \partial_{h_{m-1}} \dots \partial_{h_1} \partial_{h_0} H$ is $(n-m)$ -thick in $\Delta(A_m)$.

Granted such a sequence, we define the desired sequence $(g_i)_{i \leq n}$ as follows: by (n.1) $A_n \neq \emptyset$, so take $g \in A_n$ and for each $i \leq n$, put $g_i = gh_{\alpha_i}$, where $\alpha_i = \{n-1, n-2, \dots, i\}$. Because $g \in A_n \subseteq \bigcap_{\alpha \subseteq \bar{n}} A h_\alpha^{-1}$, $g_i \in A$ for each $i \leq n$. Also, for $i < j \leq n$, taking $\alpha := \alpha_j = \{n-1, n-2, \dots, j\}$ and $\beta := \alpha_i \setminus \alpha_j = \{j-1, j-2, \dots, i\}$ in (n.2), we get $R(gh_\alpha, gh_\alpha h_\beta)$ and thus $R(g_j, g_i)$.

Now we show how to recursively define the sequences $(h_m)_{m < n}$ and $(A_m)_{m \leq n}$. For $m = 0$, put $A_0 = A$ so it is n -recurrent, $H_0 = H$ is $\Delta(A_0)^n$ -thick because $\mathcal{F}$ is a Δ -filter, and (0.2)-(0.3) are vacuous.

Now suppose that for $m < n$, the sequences $(h_k)_{k < m}$ and $(A_k)_{k \leq m}$ are defined and satisfy conditions (m.1)-(m.4). By (m.4), $\exists^{\mathcal{F}} h_m \in H_m$ such that $\partial_{h_m} A_m$ is $(n-m-1)$ -recurrent and $H_{m+1} = \partial_{h_m} H_m$ is $(n-m-1)$ -thick in $\Delta(\partial_{h_m} A)$. Because $h_m \in H_m$, $h_m h_\alpha \in H$ for all $\alpha \subseteq \bar{m}$, so (m+1.3) holds. In particular, for all $\alpha \subseteq \bar{m}$, $R(\cdot, \cdot h_m h_\alpha)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -large, so the set

$$A_{m+1} := \partial_{h_m} A_m \cap \bigcap_{\alpha \subseteq \bar{m}} R(\cdot, \cdot h_m h_\alpha)$$

is still $(n-m-1)$ -recurrent and H_{m+1} is still $(n-m-1)$ -thick in $\Delta(A_{m+1})$. Thus, (m+1.1) and (m+1.4) are verified, and it remains to check (m+1.2). To this end, fix $\alpha, \beta \subseteq \bar{m+1}$ with $\emptyset \neq \beta < \alpha$. Note that we only need to check the case when $m \in \beta$ or $m \in \alpha$. If $m \in \beta$, then

$\alpha = \emptyset$ and $h_\beta = h_m h_{\beta'}$ for some $\beta' \subseteq \bar{m}$. Thus, by the very choice of A_{m+1} , $A_{m+1} \subseteq R(\cdot, \cdot h_m h_{\beta'})$. On the other hand, if $m \in \alpha$, then $h_\alpha = h_m h_{\alpha'}$ for some $\alpha' \subseteq \bar{m}$, so $A_{m+1} \subseteq \partial_{h_m} A_m$ and (m.2) imply

$$A_{m+1} \subseteq A_m h_m^{-1} \subseteq R(\cdot h_{\alpha'}, \cdot h_{\alpha'} h_\beta) h_m^{-1} = R(\cdot h_m h_{\alpha'}, \cdot h_m h_{\alpha'} h_\beta) = R(\cdot h_\alpha, \cdot h_\alpha h_\beta).$$

□

8. Δ -MEASURES

We define a notion of largeness that generalizes invariant finitely additive probability measures and idempotent ultrafilters, as well as subadditive notions such as the notion of upper density for subsets of amenable groups.

Definition 8.1. Let S be a set and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$ be an algebra. A *finitely subadditive probability measure* on $\mathcal{A}$ is a function $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

- (i) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0, \mu(S) = 1$;
- (ii) for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \subseteq B$ implies $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$;
- (iii) for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mu(A \cup B) \leq \mu(A) + \mu(B)$.

For $(S, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ as above, call a set $B \subseteq S$ μ -null if $B \subseteq A$ for some $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(A) = 0$. Consequently, we call a set $C \subseteq S$ μ -conull if its complement is μ -null. Note that μ -null sets form an ideal and hence μ -conull sets form a filter, which we denote by $\mathcal{F}_\mu$. We write $\forall^\mu$ and $\exists^\mu$ to mean $\forall \mathcal{F}_\mu$ and $\exists \mathcal{F}_\mu$, respectively.

Continuing the above definition, we isolate a relevant class of finitely subadditive measures on semigroups.

Definition 8.2. Let G be a semigroup, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(G)$ be an algebra and μ be a finitely subadditive measure on $\mathcal{A}$. We say that μ is *almost invariant* if we also have

- (iv) $\mathcal{A}G^{-1} := \{Ag^{-1} : A \in \mathcal{A}, g \in G\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, and for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\forall^\mu g \mu(Ag^{-1}) = \mu(A).$$

Note that for almost invariant μ , $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ is also almost invariant, and hence is a Δ -filter.

Finally, we say that μ is *additive on translates* if

- (v) for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{n-1} \in G$, if $Ag_0^{-1}, Ag_1^{-1}, \dots, Ag_{n-1}^{-1}$ are pairwise μ -almost disjoint, i.e. $\mathcal{A}g_i^{-1} \cap \mathcal{A}g_j^{-1}$ is μ -null, then

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{i < n} \mathcal{A}g_i^{-1}\right) = \sum_{i < n} \mu(\mathcal{A}g_i^{-1}).$$

If μ satisfies both (iv) and (v), we call it a Δ -measure and refer to $(G, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ as a Δ -measured semigroup.

Examples 8.3.

- (a) Idempotent ultrafilters, or more precisely, the measures associated to idempotent ultrafilters, are examples of $\{0, 1\}$ -valued additive (but not fully invariant) Δ -measures on a semigroup G .
- (b) More generally, any almost invariant filter $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F} \cup \check{\mathcal{F}}$ is a Δ -measure. This includes the Fréchet filter on any semigroup, as well as the filter of comeager sets on a Baire topological group.

- (c) For a countable amenable group G with a Følner sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we define an upper density function by letting

$$d_u(A) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap F_n|}{|F_n|},$$

for all sets $A \subseteq G$. This function d_u is a fully invariant (but not additive) Δ -measure on the algebra $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(G)$.

- (d) Every amenable group G , by definition, admits a finitely additive invariant probability measure. If G is countable, then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(G)$, while if G is locally compact Hausdorff then $\mathcal{A}$ is the σ -algebra of all sets that are measurable with respect to the Haar measure on G .
- (e) Every compact Hausdorff group admits a countably additive invariant probability measure, namely, the normalized Haar measure defined on the Borel σ -algebra.
- (f) Let $(G_n, \mathcal{A}_n, \mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of groups with finitely additive invariant probability measures and let G be their ultraproduct. Then G admits a *countably additive* invariant probability measure μ , called the Loeb measure, defined on the σ -algebra generated by the so-called internal sets.
- (g) Generalizing the last two examples, every probability group (see Definition 1 in [Tse13]), by definition, admits a countably additive invariant probability measure defined some σ -algebra $\mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 8.4 (Quantitative recurrence for Δ -measures). *Let $(G, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a Δ -measured semigroup. Then for every μ -positive set $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\exists^{\mu} h \mu(\partial_h A) \geq \frac{\mu(A)^2}{3}$.*

Proof. Put $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_\mu$, $\varepsilon = \frac{\mu(A)^2}{3}$, and assume for contradiction that $\forall^{\mathcal{F}} h \in G, \mu(\partial_h A) < \varepsilon$. Thus, for every such $h \in G$, we have $\forall^{\mathcal{F}} g \in G \mu((\partial_h A)g^{-1}) < \varepsilon$. Because $(\partial_h A)g^{-1} = Ag^{-1} \cap A(gh)^{-1}$, we get

$$\forall h \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g \mu(Ag^{-1} \cap A(gh)^{-1}) < \varepsilon.$$

Hence, defining

$$R(g_1, g_2) : \Leftrightarrow \mu(Ag_1^{-1} \cap Ag_2^{-1}) < \varepsilon,$$

for $g_1, g_2 \in G$, we have $\forall h \forall^{\mathcal{F}} g R(g, gh)$. By almost invariance, the set $\text{Stab}(A) := \{g \in G : \mu(Ag^{-1}) = \mu(A)\}$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -large and hence ∞ -recurrent because $\mathcal{F}$ is a Δ -filter. Choosing $n = \left\lceil \frac{3}{\mu(A)} \right\rceil$, apply the Δ -Ramsey theorem to R and $\text{Stab}(A)$, and get a sequence $(g_i)_{i < n} \subseteq \text{Stab}(A)$ such that $\mu(Ag_i^{-1} \cap Ag_j^{-1}) < \varepsilon$ for all $i < j$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{i < n} Ag_i^{-1}\right) &\geq \sum_{i < n} \mu(Ag_i^{-1}) - \sum_{i < j < n} \mu(Ag_i^{-1} \cap Ag_j^{-1}) \\ &> n\mu(A) - \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)\varepsilon \\ &\geq \frac{3}{\mu(A)}\mu(A) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{3}{\mu(A)} + 1\right)\frac{3}{\mu(A)}\frac{\mu(A)^2}{3} \\ &= 3 - \frac{3 + \mu(A)}{2} \geq 3 - \frac{3 + 1}{2} = 3 - 2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 8.5 (Qualitative recurrence for Δ -measures). *Let $(G, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a Δ -measured semigroup. Then every μ -positive set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is ∞ -recurrent, so every set in $\mathcal{A}$ is $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}$ -measurable.*

Proof. By the previous proposition, every μ -positive set $A \subseteq G$ is 1-recurrent, so iterating this gives n -recurrence for any $n \geq 1$. Also, one could prove this directly by running an easier (qualitative) version of the proof of the above proposition. $\square$

In terms of derivation trees, the last corollary means the following:

Corollary 8.6. *Let $(G, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a Δ -measured semigroup and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. If A is μ -positive, then $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}(A)) = \infty$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}(A)$ has infinite branches and hence $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}(A)$ contains an IP-set.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under ∂ , i.e. for any set $B \in \mathcal{A}$ and $g \in G$, $\partial_g B \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus, for any $s \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}(A)$, $\partial_s A$ is in $\mathcal{A}$ and is μ -positive, so by the previous corollary, $\partial_s A$ is 1-recurrent, and hence, $\text{ext}_{\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}(A)}(s) = \Delta(\partial_s A)$ is $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ -positive. $\square$

Combined with (c) of Proposition 6.6, Corollary 8.6 implies the following weak version of what would be a “density Hindman theorem” for Δ -measures.

Corollary 8.7. *Let $(G, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a Δ -measured semigroup. For every μ -positive set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ there is an IP-set $P = \text{FP}(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for every finite product subset $Q = \text{FP}(h_n)_{n < N}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\bigcap_{h \in Q} Ah^{-1} >_{\mathcal{F}_\mu} 0.$$

In particular, A contains shifts of arbitrarily long finite product sets, i.e. for every N , there is a finite products set Q of length N and $g \in A$ such that $A \supseteq gQ$.

9. A VAN DER CORPUT LEMMA FOR Δ -FILTERS

The following result is our main application of the Δ -Ramsey theorem.

Theorem 9.1 (Δ -van der Corput). *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Δ -filter on a semigroup G and let $(e_g)_{g \in G}$ be a bounded family in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ such that the map $g \mapsto e_g$ is weakly $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}$ -measurable, i.e. for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{g \in G : \langle e_g, f \rangle \geq \varepsilon\}$ is $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}$ -measurable. If*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, e_{gh} \rangle = 0,$$

then $\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} e_g = 0$ weakly, i.e. for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$, $\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, f \rangle = 0$.

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $\|e_g\| \leq 1$, for all $g \in G$, and fix a nonzero vector $f \in \mathcal{H}$. Suppose that the conclusion fails for this f and thus, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the set $A = \{g \in G : |\langle e_g, f \rangle| \geq \varepsilon\}$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -positive. By the hypothesis, A is ∞ -recurrent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $\|f\|^2 < n\varepsilon^2/2$ and take $\delta > 0$ small enough, so that $(n-1)\|f\|^2\delta \leq \varepsilon^2/2$. Applying the Δ -Ramsey theorem to A and the graph $R \subseteq G^2$ defined by

$$R(g_1, g_2) : \Leftrightarrow |\langle e_{g_1}, e_{g_2} \rangle| \leq \delta,$$

we get a sequence $(g_i)_{i < n}$ of elements in A such that $|\langle e_{g_i}, e_{g_j} \rangle| \leq \delta$ for $i < j$. Noting that the sequence $(e_{g_i})_{i < n}$ is pairwise orthogonal with error δ , the proof of Bessel's inequality gives a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \|f - \sum_{i < n} \langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle e_{g_i}\|^2 = \|f\|^2 - 2 \sum_{i < n} |\langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle|^2 + \sum_{i, j < n} \langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle \overline{\langle f, e_{g_j} \rangle} \langle e_{g_i}, e_{g_j} \rangle \\
&= \|f\|^2 - 2 \sum_{i < n} |\langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle|^2 + \sum_{i < n} |\langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle|^2 \|e_{g_i}\|^2 + \sum_{i, j < n, i \neq j} \|f\| \|e_{g_i}\| \|f\| \|e_{g_j}\| |\langle e_{g_i}, e_{g_j} \rangle| \\
&\leq \|f\|^2 - \sum_{i < n} |\langle f, e_{g_i} \rangle|^2 + \sum_{i, j < n, i \neq j} \|f\|^2 \delta \\
&= \|f\|^2 - n\varepsilon^2 + n(n-1)\|f\|^2 \delta \\
&\leq \|f\|^2 - n\varepsilon^2 + n\varepsilon^2/2 = \|f\|^2 - n\varepsilon^2/2 < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

By Corollary 8.5, the Δ -Ramsey theorem can be applied to all μ -positive sets $A \in \mathcal{A}$, for any Δ -measure μ . For the same reason, in the statement of the van der Corput lemma for filters $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ associated with Δ -measures μ , the assumption of $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_\mu}$ -measurability can be replaced with $\mathcal{A}$ -measurability, and it is worth stating it explicitly:

Corollary 9.2 (van der Corput for Δ -measures). *Let $(G, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a Δ -measured semigroup and let $(e_g)_{g \in G}$ be a bounded family in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ such that the map $g \mapsto e_g$ is weakly $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable, i.e. for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the set $\{g \in G : \langle e_g, f \rangle \geq \varepsilon\}$ is in $\mathcal{A}$. If*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_{gh}, e_g \rangle = 0,$$

then $\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} e_g = 0$ weakly, i.e. for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$, $\lim_{g \rightarrow \mathcal{F}} \langle e_g, f \rangle = 0$.

Moreover, recall that by Example 4.3(b), every subset of a semigroup G is Δ_{IP^*} -measurable. Therefore, Theorem 9.1, generalizes the previously established instances of it for the following filters:

1. (Furstenberg, [Fur81, Lemma 4.9]) The filter of density-1 subsets of a countable amenable group G with respect to a fixed Følner sequence.
2. (By essentially the same proof as for the previous instance) The filter of conull sets of a finitely additive invariant probability measure on a locally compact Hausdorff amenable group, with the assumption that the map $g \mapsto e_g$ is weakly Haar-measurable.
3. (Furstenberg, [Fur81, Lemma 9.24]) The IP^* -filter on a semigroup.
4. (Bergelson-McCutcheon, [BM07, Theorem 2.3]) Idempotent ultrafilters on a semigroup.
5. (Folklore) The filter of conull sets of the Haar measure on a compact Hausdorff group, with the assumption that the map $g \mapsto e_g$ is weakly Haar-measurable.
6. (By the same proof as for the previous instance) The filter of conull sets of the Loeb measure on the ultraproduct of a sequence of groups G_n equipped with a finitely additive invariant probability measure μ_n defined on an algebra $\mathcal{A}_n$, with the assumption that the map $g \mapsto e_g$ is weakly Loeb-measurable.
7. (A variant of [Tse13, Lemma 20]) For a probability group $(G, \mathcal{B}, \mu, \mathcal{B}_2, \mu_2)$ (as in Definition 1 of [Tse13]), the filter of μ -conull sets, with the assumption that the map $g \mapsto e_g$ is weakly $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable.

REFERENCES

- [Ber10] V. Bergelson, *Ultrafilters, IP sets, dynamics, and combinatorial number theory*, Ultrafilters across mathematics, Contemp. Math., vol. 530, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 23–47.
- [BG04] V. Bergelson and A. Gorodnik, *Weakly mixing group actions: A brief survey and an example*, Modern dynamical systems and applications, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004, pp. 3–25.
- [BM07] V. Bergelson and R. McCutcheon, *Central sets and a noncommutative Roth theorem*, American Journal of Mathematics **129** (2007), no. 5, 1251–1275.
- [Fur81] H. Furstenberg, *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*, Princ. Univ. Press, 1981.
- [Fur77] H. Furstenberg, *Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions*, J. d’Analyse Math. **31** (1977), 204–256.
- [FK78] H. Furstenberg and Y. Katznelson, *An ergodic Szemerédi theorem for commuting transformation*, J. d’Analyse Math. **34** (1978), 275–291.
- [Rud90] D. J. Rudolph, *Fundamentals of Measurable Dynamics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.
- [Sze75] E. Szemerédi, *On sets of integers containing no k elements in arithmetic progression*, Acta Arith. **27** (1975), 199–245.
- [Tod10] S. Todorcevic, *Introduction to Topological Ramsey Spaces*, Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [Tse13] A. Tserunyan, *Mixing and triple recurrence in probability groups*, arXiv:1405.5629 (2013), submitted.
- [vdC31] J. G. van der Corput, *Diophantische Ungleichungen. I. Zur Gleichverteilung modulo Eins*, Acta Math. **56** (1931), no. 1, 373–456.
- [Wag93] S. Wagon, *The Banach–Tarski Paradox*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, IL, 61801, USA
E-mail address: `anush@illinois.edu`